



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,239	03/03/2006	Josef Michl	1181-8 PCT US	8607
28249	7590	11/21/2008	EXAMINER	
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP			HARRIS, ALANA M	
333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD.				
SUITE 702			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
UNIONDALE, NY 11553			1643	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/21/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/542,239	MICHL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.	1643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/26/2006</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Claims 1-24 are pending.  
  
Claims 4-24, drawn to non-elected inventions are withdrawn from examination.  
  
Claims 1-3 are examined on the merits.
  
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

***Election/Restrictions***

3. Applicants note on page 3 of the Remarks submitted July 29, 2008 the technical feature recited in claim is special and therefore all five groups are linked to form a single general concept under PCT Rule 13.1. New grounds of rejection are set forth in the following 102 rejections, hence the special technical feature recited in claim 1 is still not considered special and as such are not linked.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

***Withdrawn Rejections***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hannan et al. (Molecular Biology of the Cell 13: 137A, November 2002/ IDS reference A submitted December 26, 2006) is withdrawn in light of Applicants' submission of a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 declaring inventors, Josef Michl, Stefan Bradu, Raquib Hannan and Matthew R. Pincus are the sole inventors.

5. The rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Fischer et al. (Midwood Science Awards American, October 26, 2002) is withdrawn in light of Applicants' submission of a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 declaring inventors, Josef Michl, Stefan Bradu, Raquib Hannan and Matthew R. Pincus are the sole inventors.

***New Grounds of Rejection***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent number 5,786,221 (issued July 28, 1998). The patent discloses a pancreatic antigen which is 34 KD according to SDS-PAGE, see column 6, lines 32-44.

Since the Patent and Trademark Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the disclosed antigen of the claimed invention the burden of proof is upon the Applicants to show an unobvious distinction between the structural and functional characteristics of the antigens of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 U.S.P.Q. 430 (CCPA 197) and Ex parte Gray, 10 USPQ 2d 1922 1923 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. & Int.). Furthermore, Patent owner's burden under the circumstances presented herein was described in *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433-434 (CCPA 1977) as follows:

Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior ad products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product...Whether the rejection is based on 'inherency' under 35 U.S.C. §102, on 'prima facie obviousness' under 35 U.S.C. §103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same, and its fairness is evidenced by the PTO's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior ad products (footnote omitted).

Art Unit: 1643

8. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hobbs et al. (*Oncodevelopmental Biology and Medicine* 1: 37-48, 1980), as evidenced by U.S. Patent number 4,843,019 (issued June 27, 1989). Hobbs discloses a pancreatic antigen which is 40 KD, see column 1, lines 16-33. This antigen is found in foetal pancreas and carcinoma of the pancreas and not in normal pancreas, see Figure 2 caption on page 39 of Hobbs.

Since the Patent and Trademark Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the disclosed antigen of the claimed invention the burden of proof is upon the Applicants to show an unobvious distinction between the structural and functional characteristics of the antigens of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 U.S.P.Q. 430 (CCPA 197) and *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d 1922 1923 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. & Int.). Furthermore, Patent owner's burden under the circumstances presented herein was described in *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433-434 (CCPA 1977) as follows:

Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior ad products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product...Whether the rejection is based on 'inherency' under 35 U.S.C. §102, on 'prima facie obviousness' under 35 U.S.C. §103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same, and its fairness is evidenced by the PTO's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior ad products (footnote omitted).

Art Unit: 1643

9. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication number U.S. 2002/0098581 A1 (filed December 20, 2001/ IDS reference submitted December 26, 2005). The publication discloses SK1 antigen, a pancreatic antigen, see page 10, Table 2. The disclosed antigen is 42-46 kD according to a SDS-PAGE gel, see page 2, section 0018.

Since the Patent and Trademark Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the disclosed antigen of the claimed invention the burden of proof is upon the Applicants to show an unobvious distinction between the structural and functional characteristics of the antigens of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 U.S.P.Q. 430 (CCPA 197) and Ex parte Gray, 10 USPQ 2d 1922 1923 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. & Int.). Furthermore, Patent owner's burden under the circumstances presented herein was described in *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433-434 (CCPA 1977) as follows:

Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior ad products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product...Whether the rejection is based on 'inherency' under 35 U.S.C. §102, on 'prima facie obviousness' under 35 U.S.C. §103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same, and its fairness is evidenced by the PTO's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior ad products (footnote omitted).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Alana M. Harris, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571)272-0831. The Examiner works a flexible schedule, however she can normally be reached between the hours of 7:30 am to 6:30 pm, Monday through Saturday, with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry R. Helms, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.  
06 November 2008  
/Alana M. Harris, Ph.D./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643